

Pappas Telecasting Companies' 'donation' of \$325,000 in airtime to Republican candidates in certain areas is yet another example of a powerful media group abusing its privileged access to the public airwaves.

Localism is not served when a corporate headquarters decides to provide one side in local elections a louder voice than others. During election season, local audiences should be offered genuine debate -- not disingenuous offers to "purchase" an equal amount of response time.

Pappas uses the public airwaves free of charge and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. Pappas' actions are legally questionable and cast doubt on whether Pappas truly intends to serve the public interest. Their actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. Further, they show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than just a returned postcard.

I concur the above statement that was written by Freepress.net. In addition, I would like to add that the 'donations' of time must be recorded as such and be under the same restrictions as any other corporate or private political donation as stated in law. Regardless of the legal contribution issue, though, political advertisements (donated or paid) from any party is not of value to me as a owner of the airwaves. What would be of significant value would be the broadcasting of more moderated debates with the inclusion of front running candidates as well as third party candidates. This is what I would like to see on my public airwaves. I continue to move further and further away from television because it does not serve me though it is unfortunate because it can be such a positive resource when used well. The University of Washington's broadcasting is an example of television used in a productive manner and it is representative of value to me.

Thank you,  
Joshua Bettencourt, Roseville, California